

### **REMARKS**

In the Office Action that was mailed on October 17, 2005, claims 1, 3, 7-10, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Brien; claims 2, 11-12, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Brien in view of Biegel; claims 4-6 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Brien in view of Biegel, and further in view of Treu. The foregoing rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-15 are pending in the subject application, of which claims 1 and 9-11 are independent claims.

#### **Amendments to the Claims:**

Independent claims 9 and 10 are amended herein to add the word "corresponding" to correct a typographical error. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter.

#### **Differences Between the Claimed Invention and the Cited References:**

O'Brien removes programmer comments (O'Brien, col. 12, lines 3-5) and inserts executable tag statements into source code during compilation (O'Brien, col. 3, lines 30-32). When executed, the tag statements write a tag identifying the location in the source code of the executable tag statement generating the tag. (O'Brien, col. 3, lines 32-38). Based on the respective tag values of the captured tags, O'Brien determines the source code locations that are being executed. (O'Brien, col. 3, lines 44-47). However, O'Brien's inserted executable tag statements are completely unrelated to the removed comments. O'Brien's executable tag statements do not correspond to the removed comments, and no index or decoding file is created that maps each inserted executable tag statement to the removed comments.

In contrast, in the present invention, a software program includes a text string created by a software developer. A unique tag that corresponds to the text string is inserted into the software program and an index/decoding file is created to map each tag to its corresponding text string. The text string is removed from the software program. While O'Brien removes programmer comments and inserts executable tag statements, **there is no disclosed or suggested correspondence between the removed comments and the inserted tag statements in O'Brien**. Therefore, O'Brien does not disclose or suggest the unique tag that is recited in each of independent claims 1 and 9-11 of the subject application, because the unique tag in claims 1 and 9-11 corresponds to each removed text string.

Clearly, the cited references (namely O'Brien) taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the claimed invention, and independent claims 1 and 9-11 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Dependent claims 2-8 and 12-15 are allowable based in part on their dependency from one of independent claims 1 and 9-11.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested. Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew Q. Ammon  
Reg. No. 50,346

MQA/wkk  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613  
816-474-6550